





UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		
09/670,779	09/27/2000	Paul D. Daly	99P7948US 60426-81	6743
_	san 12/19/2003		EXAMINER	
SIEMENS CO	ORPORATION		PENDLETON, BRIAN T	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT 170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2644	4
,			DATE MAILED: 12/19/200	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	L Application No.	Applicant(s)
	Application No.	
	09/670,779	DALY, PAUL D.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Brian T. Pendleton	2644
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with the	: correspondence address
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims  4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) Claim(s) 10 is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 1,4-7 and 9 is/are rejected.	eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for tute, cause the application to become ABANDO liling date of this communication, even if timely for September 2000.  This action is non-final.  Wance except for formal matters, for Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11 ion.  Idrawn from consideration.	timely filed  days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication.  NED (35 U.S.C. § 133). filed, may reduce any  prosecution as to the merits is
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an Application Papers	id/di diddiidii eq	
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)  Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	accepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.  For ection is required if the drawing(s) in the Examiner. Note the attached O	is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  ffice Action or form PTO-152.
a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docur  2. Certified copies of the priority docur  3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But  * See the attached detailed Office action for attached detailed Office action for attached as specific reference was included in the since a specific reference was included in the specific reference was included	ments have been received. ments have been received in App priority documents have been re ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). a list of the certified copies not re- mestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § ne first sentence of the specificati ge provisional application has been	lication No ceived in this National Stage ceived. 119(e) (to a provisional application) on or in an Application Data Sheet. on received.
Attachment(s)  1) ⊠ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) □ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-943) ⊠ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper N	48) 5) Notice of Info	mmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ormal Patent Application (PTO-152) .



Art Unit: 2644

### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald et al, GB 2 252 657 A, "Vibration and sound generation in vehicles" in view of Reighard et al. McDonald et al teach a system comprising active noise cancellation module 30 which has control for determining a cancellation function through differential amplifiers 40, bandpass filters 41 and CPU 44. The noise cancellation signal is output through speakers 11 and vibrating elements 8 (see pages 8 and 9). The speakers and vibration elements also reproduce audio sounds produced by vehicle sound source 15, which are based on vehicle operation (last paragraph, page 6 - first paragraph, page 7). The output from the sound source 15 is switchable by the user. The vehicle sound source 15 is mixed with the noise canceling signal in mixer 9 and output to the speakers. As suggested, the sound source can be any desirable sound during operation of vehicle. At the time of invention, a warning sound from a horn was desirable and occurs during operation of a vehicle. Reighard et al disclose a horn apparatus comprising switch (piezoelectric member) 50 and speaker 85. Activation of the switch 50 triggers a horn sound source from speaker 85. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the

Application/Control Number: 09/670,779

Art Unit: 2644

horn of Reighard et al in the invention of McDonald et al. The advantage of having a horn in the McDonald et al would have been to converse space. One of ordinary skill in the art without undue experimentation would have realized to use the horn of Reighard et al as the sound source 15 in McDonald et al since McDonald et al suggested vehicle operation sounds. By inserting the horn as the sound source, an existing speaker could be used for the horn output instead of a separate speaker which would take up more space under the hood of the vehicle. Claims 1 and 7 are met. As to claims 4 and 9, at the time of invention, inherently horns were actuated when the vehicle key was in the "on" or "off" position. Regarding claim 5, the combination comprises a horn sound source in a noise cancellation environment. Reighard et al do not teach any restrictions on the horn use, therefore the horn sound would be reproduced when the key is at the "on" position and regardless of the operation of the noise cancellation system. Per claim 6, there is a CODEC in CPU unit 44.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 10 is allowed.

Claims 2, 3 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Rowley et al, Chatwell, and Tomisawa et al.

Application/Control Number: 09/670,779

Art Unit: 2644

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian T. Pendleton whose telephone number is (703) 305-9509. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester W. Isen can be reached on (703) 305-4386. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

2.22=

Brian Tyrone Pendleton December 10, 2003 XU MEI